

*H. S. J.*  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII LIBRARY

# Rhodora

JOURNAL OF THE  
NEW ENGLAND BOTANICAL CLUB

---

Conducted and published for the Club, by

MERRITT LYNDON FERNALD, Editor-in-Chief

JAMES FRANKLIN COLLINS  
CHARLES ALFRED WEATHERBY }  
LUDLOW GRISCOM                      Associate Editors

---

---

Vol. 36.

July, 1934.

No. 427.

CONTENTS:

Draba in temperate Northeastern America. <i>M. L. Fernald</i> .....	241
Past Periods of Eelgrass Scarcity. <i>Clarence Cottam</i> .....	261
New Variety of <i>Glyceria grandis</i> and Key to its Allied Species. <i>Leon Kelso</i> .....	264
Three Interesting New Plants from Wallowa County, Oregon. <i>M. E. Peck</i> .....	266
Synonymy of <i>Phyllanthus brasiliensis</i> . <i>L. B. Smith</i> .....	268

---

---

The New England Botanical Club, Inc.

8 and 10 West King St., Lancaster, Pa.

Room 1001, 53 State St., Boston, Mass.

**RHODORA.**—A monthly journal of botany, devoted primarily to the flora of New England. Price, \$2.00 per year, net, postpaid, in funds payable at par in United States currency in Boston; single copies (if available) 20 cents. Volumes 1-8 or some single numbers from them can be supplied only at advanced prices which will be furnished on application. Notes and short scientific papers, relating directly or indirectly to the plants of the northeastern states, will be considered for publication to the extent that the limited space of the journal permits. Forms will be closed five weeks in advance of publication. Authors (of more than two pages of print) will receive 25 copies of the issue in which their contributions appear. Extracted reprints, if ordered in advance, will be furnished at cost.

Address manuscripts and proofs to

M. L. FERNALD, 14 Hawthorn Street, Cambridge, Mass.

Subscriptions (making all remittances payable to RHODORA) to  
Ludlow Griscom, 8 W. King St., Lancaster, Pa., or Museum of Comparative  
Zoology, Cambridge, Mass.

Entered at Lancaster, Pa., Post Office as Second Class Mail Matter.

---

**INTELLIGENCER PRINTING COMPANY**  
*Specialists in Scientific and Technical Publications*  
EIGHT WEST KING ST., LANCASTER, PA.

---

**CARD-INDEX OF NEW GENERA, SPECIES AND VARIETIES OF  
AMERICAN PLANTS, 1885 TO DATE.**

For American taxonomists and all students of American plants the most important supplement to the Index Kewensis, this catalogue in several ways exceeds the latter work in detail, since it lists not only the flowering plants, but ferns and other vascular cryptogams, and includes not merely genera and species, but likewise subspecies, varieties and forms. A work of reference invaluable for larger herbaria, leading libraries, academies of sciences, and other centers of botanical activity. Issued quarterly, at \$22.50 per 1000 cards.

GRAY HERBARIUM of Harvard University,  
Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.

---

**CHECK LIST OF GRAY'S MANUAL, 7th EDITION,** compiled by  
M. A. DAY. Leatherette. Pocket size. Invaluable for collector's  
memoranda and herbarium records. Published and sold by the GRAY  
HERBARIUM, Cambridge, Mass. Price postpaid 20 cts. each. Ten  
copies \$1.50.

---

**MEMOIRS OF THE GRAY HERBARIUM.** A series of illustrated  
quarto papers issued at irregular intervals, sold separately.

No. III. The Linear-leaved North American Species of Potamogeton,  
Section Axillares, by M. L. Fernald. 183 pp., 40 plates, 31 maps. 1932.  
\$3.00.

Gray Herbarium of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

---

*Advertisements of Nurserymen and Dealers in Botanical and other Scientific Publications are inserted in these pages at the following rates per space of 4 in. by 3/4 in. 1 year \$4.00, 6 months \$2.50.*

# Rhodora

JOURNAL OF

THE NEW ENGLAND BOTANICAL CLUB

---

Vol. 36.

July, 1934.

No. 427.

---

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE GRAY HERBARIUM  
OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY—NO. CV.

DRABA IN TEMPERATE NORTHEASTERN AMERICA

M. L. FERNALD

(Plates 290–319)

## INTRODUCTION

IN the northeastern United States the genus *Draba* is only slightly developed and without taxonomic difficulty; but northeastward, on the Gaspé Peninsula, in western Newfoundland and on the Labrador Peninsula, the genus begins to show some of the diversities and complexities which, in cordilleran North America, Europe, boreal and alpine Asia and the Arctic, render its satisfactory classification most difficult. The recent studies of types of arctic American species by Mrs. Elisabeth Ekman,<sup>1</sup> the studies of Asiatic species by Pohle<sup>2</sup> and the ostensibly world-wide (but chiefly Eurasian) monograph of *Draba* by O. E. Schulz<sup>3</sup> have made it opportune, or at least desirable, to attempt to set our own Drabas in order. For her very painstaking

<sup>1</sup> Elisabeth Ekman: *Nomenclature of some North-European Drabae*, Arkiv. f. Bot. xii, no. 7: 1–17, t. 1 (Nov., 1912); *Hvad är Draba hirta L.?*, Bot. Notiser (1913), 183–192 (1913); *Zur Kenntnis der Nordischen Hochgebirgs-Drabae*, Kgl. Svenska Vet.-Akad. Handl. lvii, no. 3: 1–68, tt. 1–3 (1917), ser. 3, ii, no. 7: 1–56, tt. 1–3 (1926); *Studies in the Genus Draba*, Svensk. Bot. Tidskrift, xxiii. 476–495 (1929); *Contribution to the Draba Flora of Greenland*. II, ibid, xxiv. 280–297, t. iii (1930); *Contribution, etc.* III, ibid, xxv. 465–495, t. v (1931); *Contribution, etc.* IV, ibid, xxvi. 431–447 (1932); *Contribution, etc.* V, ibid, xxvii. 97–103 (1933); *Contribution, etc.* VI, ibid, xxvii. 339–346 (1933).

<sup>2</sup> R. Pohle, *Drabae asiaticae*, Fedde, Report. Beiheft, xxxii. 1–225 (1925).

<sup>3</sup> O. E. Schulz in Engler, Pflanzenr. iv<sup>105</sup> (1927).

search for the historic type-specimens of the Greenland and other arctic species and for her critical discussions of them we owe gratitude to Mrs. Ekman, who has been able to clarify many formerly obscure situations.

The inherent difficulty of the group, however, coupled, it would seem, with lack of clarity in definition, is peculiarly emphasized by Schulz's treatment. To use his keys, whether to the sections or within the sections, with possibility of arriving at even a doubtfully satisfactory identification, one needs to have had much experience in following down false leads and in successively trying another and another, until eventually some sort of "identification" is achieved. Such misleading and carelessly constructed keys are altogether too familiar in the work of certain Americans; they are not at all confined to European taxonomy, although the sum-total of inadequate and discouraging keys in *Das Pflanzenreich* is disproportionately large. A few illustrations, taken chiefly from species of our eastern American flora, will clearly bring out the inadequacy of these keys.

In the Shickshock Mountains of Gaspé there occurs a densely humifuse and matted, glabrous plant (PLATE 292)<sup>1</sup> with naked, filiform scapes a few centimeters high, which has erroneously passed as *Draba fladnizensis* Wulfen or as the closely related *D. lactea* Adams or *D. fladnizensis*, var. *heterotricha* (Lindbl.) Ball (PLATE 291). The plant is one of four scapose species found (thus far) about the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the others being the well-known stellate-pubescent *D. nivalis* Liljeblad (PLATE 295, FIGS. 1-3), another but apparently undescribed species (PLATE 295, FIGS. 4-7) also with stellate pubescence, as yet known only from a single collection, and the strongly hispid *D. rupestris* R. Br. (PLATE 293), likewise known near the Gulf of St. Lawrence from a single station only. In the present connection the important point to note is, that these plants are normally scapose, only very exceptionally with 1 or 2 small bracteal leaves, the filiform scapes usually only 1-10 cm. high. Consequently, a botanist without uncanny intuition or without special forewarning would inevitably look for them all under the 1st main division of the genus in Schulz's treatment.

**A. Caules floriferi aphylli, scapiformes.**

But, alas, not one of them, nor the species to which Schulz refers them, is treated by him in the scapiform group! On the contrary, all

<sup>1</sup> This paper being originally published in parts, the plates may not occur in the installments where occasionally cited.

four of the species to which these tiny scapose plants have been referred are found extensively treated under

**B.** *Caules floriferi* ± *foliosi*.

This is the more disconcerting since the monographer correctly describes *D. nivalis* with "Caules filiformes, . . . aphylli vel monophylli," *D. rupestris* with "Caules tenuissimi, aphylli vel monophylli" and *D. fladnizensis* with "Caules . . . aphylli vel sub flore imo folio unico praediti"; and in his fig. 28,J he shows the latter with 5 entirely naked scapes and 2 with a bract subtending the lower pedicel; while in his fig. 25,H he correctly illustrates *D. lactea* with absolutely leafless scapes. The only species of our area (in northern Labrador) admitted by Schulz to his "**A.** *Caules floriferi aphylli, scapiformes*" is *D. alpina* L. (PLATE 290); but its very remote segregation in the key from the others is not made clear by the essentially identical descriptive phrase, in the specific treatment, "Caules . . . plerumque aphylli, rarius monophylli." The fundamental trouble, of course, is the altogether too common one of trying to build mutually exclusive keys upon a single inconstant character, without giving warning of exceptions, as a careful systematist would endeavor to do. This reliance upon single inconstant characters is found, also, in the keys to species within the artificially separated sections.

One other illustration, this based on undoubtedly members of group "**B.**" is illuminating. One of the comparatively frequent species of easternmost Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador is the biennial *D. incana* L. (PLATE 299), often with excessively leafy flowering stem, the crowded leaves up to 95 in number: "foliis numerosis (usque ad 50 vel etiam ad 95 . . . ) valde approximatis"—Schulz, l. c. 285. One would, therefore, promptly key it (Schulz, l. c. 19) to

I. *Caules foliis multis densifolii* . . . Sec. XII. **Phyllodraba**,

a section in which Schulz places our *D. aurea* M. Vahl (PLATE 296), with "Caules . . . crebre (8-16-) foliati" (which is not a very large number) but, also, the Japanese *D. Sakuraii* Makino with "Caules . . . 3-6-phylli," the Colorado *D. crassa* Rydb. (*D. chrysanthia* Wats., 1882, not C. Koch, 1847) with "Caules floriferi . . . paucifolii" (the specimens have 1-5 leaves), the Californian *D. corrugata* Wats., well illustrated by Schulz, his fig. 23, showing the few leaves of the primary axis (as in Watson's type) 0.5-1 cm. or more apart (not well described by Schulz's sectional "Caules foliis multis densifolii") and, finally, the New Mexican *D. mogollonica*

Greene, with "Folia . . . caulina . . . pauca (1-3), remota"!! But, *D. incana* "foliis numerosis (usque ad 50 vel etiam ad 95 . . .) valde approximatis" is not placed by Schulz in § *Phylodraba*. Instead, it is exhaustively treated and over-divided in § XIV.

**Leucodraba**, under the call

II. Caules foliis paucis remotis paucifolii.

The preceding instances illustrate the difficulty of interpreting correctly Schulz's sectional groupings of *Draba*, at least those represented in North America. Similar difficulties, most unfortunately, are met in coordinating the specific diagnoses with the key-characters given by him. For example, in sect. *Leucodraba* the key to subsect. *Holarges* (pp. 204-206) is of vast importance to students of the boreal floras. The first division is

a. Siliculae ellipsoideae,

as opposed to

b. Siliculae oblongae vel lineares.

Nevertheless, species covered in the key only under "a. Siliculae ellipsoideae" (nec "oblongae vel lineares") are further defined as follows: *D. hirta*, "Siliculae ex ovato lanceolatae" (p. 204); *D. subamplexicaulis*, "Siliculae . . . oblongae" (p. 273); *D. daurica*, "Siliculae . . . oblongae" (p. 274); *D. arabisans*, "Siliculae . . . lineari-lanceolatae, semper acuminatae" (p. 275); *D. Henneana*, "Siliculae . . . oblongae vel ex ovato oblongae" (p. 276); *D. mongolica*, "Siliculae . . . ovoideae vel anguste lanceolatae, acutae" (p. 278); *D. sachalinensis*, "Siliculae ovato-lanceolatae, . . . ad apicem in stylum . . . attenuatae" (p. 281); *D. incana*, "Siliculae . . . lanceolatae vel oblongae" (p. 283); etc. The inclusion in the key of numerous species as having siliques ellipsoid, as opposed to oblong or linear, and then the further definitions of them as having the siliques oblong, ovoid, lanceolate or linear-lanceolate and acuminate or attenuate (surely not ellipsoid) is such evident contradiction and leads to such inevitable perplexity that one wonders if the many European admirers of Schulz's work have actually faced the problem of using his keys. Schulz's descriptions of species and his bibliography are of remarkably high quality; it is, therefore, the more to be regretted that his keys are so misleading. To some of us, who have long worked in taxonomy, the test of monographic work is the accurate construction of the keys; unless the keys unlock the doors it is impossible to enter.

This extreme difficulty or impossibility of arriving surely at a correct identification by trying to follow the keys in Schulz's monograph is not the only reason for my boldness in attempting to work out some sort of recognizable classification of our Drabas. The group is a most interesting element in the more localized or isolated floras of northeastern America and its geographic as well as taxonomic relationships are important to understand. Furthermore, the full content of the *Draba* flora of the temperate latitudes of eastern North America has been most inadequately appreciated. The greatest development of the genus in America is, of course, in the cordilleran region, with the Arctic next; but in the area covered by Gray's *Manual*, thence east to Newfoundland and north across the Labrador Peninsula or south into Georgia, we now know at least 25 true species, and several more are doubtless present.

The utter inadequacy of treatments of *Draba* for the area just defined becomes emphasized when it is noted that in Schulz's monograph ONLY 135 SPECIMENS in the entire genus are cited from the area above defined, and those are largely of the well known annual and biennial species of the South (*D. caroliniana* Walt., *D. cuneifolia* Nutt., *D. brachycarpa* Nutt., etc.). However, in the Gray Herbarium alone (to say nothing of the Canadian National Herbarium, the herbarium of the University of Montreal, the United States National Herbarium, and numerous other large herbaria in the Eastern States, which would more than double the number) the single species, *D. arabisans* Michx., is represented by 154 sheets; while *D. glabella* Pursh (*D. hirta* of most eastern American authors, including *D. Henneana* of Schulz's treatment and *D. daurica* of Mrs. Ekman's) has 137 sheets.

For all of North America (excluding Greenland) Schulz cites only a single atypical (and apparently not conspecific) number (PLATE 303, FIG. 1) from the Gaspé Peninsula to represent *D. norvegica* Gunner (PLATE 301); yet the Gray Herbarium alone exhibits 87 sheets or numbers of *D. norvegica* from Newfoundland and Quebec Labrador! Again, *D. rupestris* R. Br. (PLATE 293) is recognized by Schulz only from Scotland and the Faeröes. Nevertheless, had he done what a monographer of a world-wide genus should be expected to do, namely, visited the larger American herbaria before writing with quasi authority on American plants, the author would have found at the easternmost of the great herbaria (the Gray Herbarium) plants from Newfoundland (PLATE 293, FIG. 2) and Labrador (FIG. 3) which seem quite

inseparable from authentic specimens (FIG. 1) from the type-locality of *D. rupestris*, Ben Lawers in Scotland, except that they are sturdier.

Unfortunately, one can hardly feel that the treatment of *Draba* in *Das Pflanzenreich* shows any more understanding of American plants than has been indicated for other groups by writers of certain treatments in some other volumes in the series. The prevalent European assumption that American plants can be adequately known and understood without visiting and studying the large American herbaria, where the bulk of American specimens are, naturally, preserved and where European visitors would be most cordially welcomed, is one of the greatest fallacies of much Old World taxonomic publication, ostensibly of world-wide scope. It is, I realize, a thankless and unappreciated, if not quite useless task for a mere American to point out weaknesses in the work of some European taxonomists (and other botanists);<sup>1</sup> but, surely, the publications in Europe on American groups would be less open to just criticism if their sponsors would see to it that only the most scholarly work, based upon a truly adequate understanding of the plants and upon ability clearly to present the results, were published. It requires a degree of assurance, which most of us lack, and an opportunity to study extensively in the greater herbaria all over the world, an opportunity which comes to few, properly to prepare the specialist for a monograph of world-wide scope. Such a fortuitous combination of requirements is not common and, perhaps, has never been achieved, but it is certainly not too much to expect that those who undertake cosmopolitan monographs should make some effort to meet these elementary requirements.

Some years prior to the World War, the author of one of the voluminous German monographs (of a genus with 400–500 species in North America) wished, what was obviously out of the question (as wholly crippling work at the lending institution), to borrow many thousands of irreplaceable sheets (including all types) of his assigned group from the Gray Herbarium. Being then a bachelor, with a

<sup>1</sup> The late Charles Baron Clarke, F.R.S., F.L.S., one of the most prolific writers on the *Cyperaceae*, once wrote: "All papers, at least of a systematic kind, prepared in Asia, Africa, or America, must be, as literary work [he omitted to say "as systematic work"], very poor performances in the eyes of botanists in the herbaria of London, Paris, and Geneva [for some reason omitting Berlin]."—C. B. Clarke, Journ. Linn. Soc. Bot. xxi. 2 (1884). To one who has some familiarity with *Carex* in North America it is appalling to see how thoroughly the more technical groups of American *Carex* (like the *Ovales*) were misidentified and with what notes of assurance they were mislabelled by Clarke in the herbarium at Kew.

t /

larger proctorial suite of rooms than I needed, I invited my German colleague to spend two or three months in Cambridge as my personal guest. His reply intimated a reason which, unfortunately, limits the possibilities of broad outlook everywhere: "Mit besten Dank bescheinige ich Ihnen den Empfang Ihres Briefes. . . . Lebhaft bedauere ich vorerst nich persönlich Ihre Bekanntschaft in Cambridge machen zu koennen, wir haben in Deutschland Geld für alles, nur nicht für die Wissenschaft."

Even the best of European taxonomic work on groups largely American, conscientiously done by a master of the group, loses much of its implied completeness and authority when, owing to neglect of all except a few continental herbaria, its author fails to study many thousands of American specimens which would clarify his understanding and make his work more truly cosmopolitan. Thus, in Niedenzu's potentially great monograph of the largely American family (seven-eighths American) *Malpighiaceae* there is, as Gleason has already clearly pointed out, "extraordinary and astounding neglect of American material." As Gleason, further, quite justly says, "a visit to America is certainly not too much to expect of the author of a volume for such a dignified and ostensibly authoritative work as the *Pflanzenreich*. . . . Finally, it seems that the present author would be informed and all future authors in the *Pflanzenreich* warned that there are two large herbaria in London and several large herbaria in the Americas, all of which contain much material of importance in the monographing of any group of plants."<sup>1</sup> Dozens (on the average) of American taxonomists annually visit the larger herbaria of Europe for study of types and authentic material. The European taxonomist, one would suppose, would find it absolutely essential to visit the greater American herbaria, if he expects adequately to understand American plants or if he hopes to have his outputtings on American groups respected by American botanists

<sup>1</sup> Gleason, Review of Niedenzu's *Malpighiaceae*, *Torreya*, xxx. 101–103 (1930).

The very natural and human but unfortunate tendency to attempt world-monographs from a wholly provincial viewpoint is not new. The pantropical genus *Smilax* has great development in southeastern Asia (including French Indo-China) and in eastern America. In view of the amazingly important and voluminous collections from these areas accumulated at the Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris (and elsewhere), the following passage, written in Geneva in 1878, by Alphonse and Casimir DeCandolle is significant: "Les Smilacées ont été l'objet de deux très-bons travaux, . . . Kunth, dans le cinquième volume de son *Enumeration*, publié en 1850, a décrit très-soigneusement les espèces, du moins celles qu'il voyait dans son herbier, dans celui de Luca ou dans l'herbier royal de Berlin, car il ne mentionne aucune des autres grandes collections, pas même celles de Paris où il a résidé si longtemps."—A. & C. DC., *Mon. Phan.* i. 2 (1878).

as satisfactory world-treatments. By crossing the Atlantic and making use<sup>1</sup> of our important herbaria he would, also, give us an opportunity to reciprocate the many courtesies and attentions we so regularly receive when we visit the Old World botanical centers.

Greater intercourse between the taxonomists of the Old World and the New would do much further to remove or to modify the once disdainful attitude toward American herbaria and botanical publication and the once frequent assumption of finality of botanical knowledge and of its monopoly in limited areas, above referred to. With a less restricted conception of the physiographic, consequently botanical, diversity of regions outside Eurasia the following incident of a not very distant past would hardly recur. A sumptuous Old World monograph of a large boreal genus recognizes but 2 species in Newfoundland, each represented by a single specimen seen. We now know 9 species in that country, represented by nearly 100 numbers in the Gray Herbarium alone. Twenty years after the publication of the monograph I wrote its author, offering to send material of additional species. The reply was: "Ich fürchte dass ich nicht 6-8 Arten aus Newfoundland werde anerkennen können. Ich habe bis heute, obwohl ich viel neues Material in der Hand hatte, keinen Grund gefunden, von dem in meiner Monographie angenommenen Artenumfang abzugehen." If the perfectly frank author here quoted had seen the larger American herbaria, his outlook would have been quite different; at least, he would have had the opportunity for new light.

After openly regretting the weaknesses in the work on American species of the most prolific writer on the *Cruciferae*, it is perhaps unseemly to venture a paper on so difficult a group as *Draba*. It is, however, with full realization of the difficulties but with the hope of at least somewhat clarifying our understanding of our own plants that the present synopsis is presented; only by painstakingly working out the species in natural areas can we attain the proper bases for world-monographs. The lines drawn between species, for instance between *D. rupestris* (PLATE 293) and *D. norvegica* (PLATES 301, 302), when fuller experience justifies, may have to be modified or abolished. In a group where morphological characters of flower and seed are almost wanting and where habit and character of pubescence are more than usually depended upon that is inevitable.

<sup>1</sup> I do not mean to imply that the bulk of specimens in American herbaria can be divided and shared, as one European visitor has repeatedly requested.

The names, likewise, may eventually need some alteration. Without the most intensive understanding of the plants and the most intelligent comparison of adequate series of specimens with the type-specimens, when they can be located, there is constant danger of going astray. In many cases I have been forced, at least for the present, to accept the verdicts of others, especially Mrs. Ekman, Pohle and Schulz, regarding such identities. As pointed out, however, in the discussion of *D. glabella* (PLATES 307–312) Mrs. Ekman recently (1917) asserted with some confidence that the boreal plant which has oftenest (but erroneously) passed as *D. hirta* L. is not that Linnean species, but is a series of boreal subspecies and varieties of the Patagonian *D. magellanica* Lam.; the plants with pubescent siliques being *D. magellanica*, subsp. *cinerea* (Adams) Elis. Ekm. with its var. *dovrensis* (Fries) Elis. Ekm.; those with glabrous siliques *D. magellanica*, subsp. *borea* Elis. Ekm. Very soon, however, she withdrew two of the boreal plants from the Patagonian, her *D. magellanica*, subsp. *cinerea* again (and rightly, it seems to me) becoming (1929) *D. cinerea* Adams (1817) and her *D. magellanica*, subsp. *borea* identified (1930), correctly, with *D. daurica* DC. (1821); but *D. magellanica*, var. *dovrensis* was left unchanged, except that Mrs. Ekman finally considered it a hybrid of *D. daurica* and *D. cinerea*, an origin hardly probable for the true Patagonian *D. magellanica*. Through the generosity of my former student Mr. J. Francis Macbride, I have a photograph and detailed account of the type of *D. daurica* DC. (1821), PLATE 308, FIG. 3. Through the great kindness of Prof. J. Milbraed, Curator of the Botanical Museum at Berlin-Dahlem, the actual type (PLATE 308, FIG. 2) of *D. Henniana* Schlechtendal (1836) is before me. Through Mrs. Ekman and Dr. Porsild I have many sheets identified by Mrs. Ekman as *D. daurica* (1821) and as *D. magellanica*, var. *borea* (1917). So far as I can make out they are conspecific; but a still earlier name has been overlooked. *D. glabella* Pursh (1814), with an unfortunately misleading name for a plant with stellate pubescence on rosette-leaves, stem, caudine-leaves and sometimes the siliques!, was based on a specimen in the Banks Herbarium, from Hudson Bay. The excellent photograph (PLATE 308, FIG. 1) of it kindly supplied by Mr. Ramsbottom, Keeper of Botany in the British Museum, with detailed notes on all technical characters by his associate, Mr. Exell, leaves no question that *D. glabella* (1814) is conspecific with the others and antedates them all, except *D. magellanica* Lam. (1786), with which I am not convinced that the boreal plants are conspecific.

I have, unhappily, been obliged to point out the inadequacy of certain European work upon the American species of *Draba* and some other groups. Another disconcerting tendency, especially of some Swedish students, is to see hybrids in every plant they do not promptly understand. Floderus, following this wholly hypothetical and very dubious course, has treated nearly all Greenland *Salices* as hybrids. Few representatives of species are found, according to him, in Greenland. It is, consequently, astounding that so many of the Greenland specimens of *Salix* should be inseparable from common plants of the coast of Labrador, northwestern Newfoundland and Gaspé, where at least one of the hypothetical parents assigned by Floderus for the Greenland plants does not occur. Along the same line, Mrs. Ekman has marked a large proportion of the specimens, which she did not understand, in the National Herbarium of Canada as hybrids or probable hybrids of far-distant parents.

As an illustration of this easy but specious method of solving the identity of a plant I may cite no. 1920 of the Canadian National Herbarium, originally distributed as *Draba aurea* M. Vahl, from sand and gravel, Little Charlton Island, James Bay, July 14, 1887, J. M. Macoun. The three plants on the sheet at Ottawa are passing from flower to fruit, showing the short and thick, strictly terminal racemes, the long soft pilosity of the  $20 \pm$  crowded cauline leaves and the stems, the characteristic retrorse villosity of the siliques, the long style (1 mm. long) and the golden petals which at once characterize *D. minganensis* (Victorin) Fernald (PLATES 297, 298), a species with three areas of extreme localization: the Mingan Islands, north of Anticosti; cliffs of Bic, Rimouski Co., Quebec; and limestone islands of James Bay. Yet Mrs. Ekman, not knowing Canadian Drabas from field-experience, labels the Little Charlton Island plant "*Draba aurea* M. Vahl, f., potius hybrida: *D. aurea*  $\times$  *daurica* (an = *D. arabisans* Michx.)."

The white-flowered *Draba daurica* (i.e. *D. glabella*), with closely pannose-stellate pubescence on leaves and stems and with only 1-5 cauline leaves, and glabrous to sparsely stellate-hirtellous siliques with styles barely 0.5 mm. long (see PLATE 307), occurs in all the areas of *D. minganensis* but its relationship to that species is merely geographic. *D. arabisans* (PLATES 314, 315) is an endemic of eastern North America, with the pubescence of basal foliage and stem minutely stellate-pannose, the 3-12 cauline leaves scattered, the siliques glabrous and the petals white. It has no close relationship to *D.*

*minganensis* nor has it ever been found either on the Mingan Islands or about James Bay, where it should be expected if it has there produced stable and fully fertile offspring. As for *D. aurea*, that very characteristic species of the North (PLATE 296), is the only one of the three hypothetical parents of Mrs. Ekman's supposed hybrid which is related to *D. minganensis*. It is at once distinguished, however, by the slender and very elongate, leafy-bracted raceme. Furthermore, it is quite unknown about the Gulf of St. Lawrence and, consequently, can hardly have helped give rise to the Mingan and Bic colonies of the very characteristic *D. minganensis*.

Just as this is going to press another of Mrs. Ekman's interpretations of an endemic American species comes to hand. Lest to those who do not know the plants concerned or American geography or who do not check the statements of fact it may seem that I am overstressing the absurdities which the hybridophile will fail to see, I am here quoting Mrs. Ekman's complete statement.

#### **Draba arabisans Michx.**

In the year 1911, on my first visit to the Copenhagen Herbarium, the late Professor OSTENFELD had the kindness to show me a specimen of *D. arabisans* Michx. which had been obtained from MICHaux<sup>1</sup> countryman, DESFONTAINES, and might possibly be regarded as a second-type. It was not until 1927 that I had an opportunity to see and examine MICHaux<sup>1</sup> type in the Musée du Jardin des Plantes in Paris. I then found, that the type-specimen in every respect agreed with DESFONTAINES's plant and that the two plants probably had once belonged to the same tuft. The stalks of MICHaux<sup>1</sup> own type were perhaps a little taller, at least one of them, which was somewhat branched at the top.

When examining the specimens of *D. aurea* in the Copenhagen Herb., in 1931, I was struck by the correspondence which I found to exist between certain of the aforesaid hybridous forms of *D. aurea* and the specimen of *D. arabisans* Michx. donated by DESFONTAINES. Through a microscopical examination of the latter I have been convinced of the identity of this form with the hybrid of *D. aurea* × *daurica*. To the naked eye the fruits of *D. arabisans* looked glabrous, but under the microscope a few hairs were found in the margin of the valves of some of them. The cruciate hairs on the leaves of *D. arabisans* are shorter and more branched than those of *D. aurea*. The style is shorter than that of *D. aurea* but longer than that of *D. daurica*, the pedicels longer and more spreading than in the latter species and the raceme consequently broader; the pods are slightly twisted. The cauline leaves are of an intermediate number, viz. 6–7 on each stalk, and the stalks are bare between the upper cauline leaf and the lowest pedicel. . . .

MICHaux<sup>1</sup> diagnosis is very incomplete, but one characteristic deserves to be remembered, viz. the pointed styles. This may mean that the pods are pointed at the apex, a characteristic which agrees with the pods of both *D. arabisans* and *D. aurea*. *D. arabisans* was collected by MICHaux

in the Hudson Bay area ("Hudson Strait") and there both *D. aurea* and *D. daurica* are to be found. It is a pity that no distinct proof can be given of the hybridogeny of *D. arabisans*. One has only to study all intermediate forms between *D. aurea* and *D. daurica*, and among them there will probably be found some that agree with the type of *D. arabisans*. Some forms, labelled *D. arabisans* by American botanists, resemble closely *D. daurica*, and are possibly derived from a second crossing, viz. between *D. arabisans* and *D. daurica*. In the specimens found by Messrs A. E. & R. T. PORSILD in 1928 at the Great Bear Lake, the characteristics from *D. aurea* were, however, present, though latent and not obvious.

And finally I only wish to propound: E. GREENE described *D. praealta* with white flowers in *Pittonia* III (1898), p. 306. In the Manual of Botany of Centr. Rocky Mountains by J. M. COULTER and AVEN NELSON (1909), p. 222 *D. lapilutea* (which according to RYDBERG and SCHULZ is the same plant) is described with yellow flowers. Is this plant possibly also a form of the hybrid of *D. aurea* × *daurica*, of which *D. arabisans* seems to be one? *D. praealta* has been regarded as an annual or biennial plant, but some specimens in the herbaria, for instance no. 22875 in the National Herbarium of Ottawa, which was collected by J. W. BELL in 1900, are obviously perennials.<sup>1</sup>

It is most distasteful to be unable always to agree with others; it is most unfortunate that some whom we should like to accept as authoritative students fail to check their own statements and so easily reach important decisions with inadequate understanding of the plants they discuss. Michaux's complete discussion of *Draba arabisans* was as follows:

ARABISANS. D. caule folioso, simplici vel rarius ramoso: foliis radicalibus cuneato-lanceolatis; caulinis lanceolatis; omnibus acutis: siliculis stylo acuminatis.

*Obs.* Affinis *D. incanae*; minus ramosa; racemo fructifero minus elongato: siliculis longioribus: foliis caulinis dissitis.

*Hab.* in rupibus ripariis ad lacum Champlain et in Nova Anglia.

Nevertheless, in a paper on GREENLAND Drabas, Mrs. Ekman states, without a word of qualification, that "*D. arabisans* was collected by Michaux in the Hudson Bay area ('Hudson Strait')." A glance at Michaux's own statement is sufficient to show the complete inaccuracy of this assertion. Lake Champlain, about 125 miles (200 km.) long, separates the states of Vermont and New York, extending slightly into southernmost Quebec. It has an altitude of 96 feet (29.4 m.) and a flora of Alleghenian type, slightly verging on warm-Canadian. Its northernmost shore is MORE THAN 1100 MILES (1770 KM.) SOUTH OF THE NEAREST POINT OF HUDSON STRAIT. Michaux's routes are perfectly well known;<sup>2</sup> the nearest he ever got to

<sup>1</sup> Elis. Ekman, *Contribution to the Draba Flora of Greenland*, VII: *Draba arabisans* Michx., *Svensk Bot. Tidskr.* xxviii. 79–81 (1934).

<sup>2</sup> See *Journal of André Michaux*. 1787–1796, with an Introduction and Notes by Charles Sprague Sargent. *Proc. Am. Phil. Soc.* xxvi. no. 129 (1889).

Hudson Strait (except possibly in crossing the ocean) was the northern bend of Rupert River, 700 miles (1125 km.) to the south.

Mrs. Ekman's misstatement of the source of the type of *Draba arabisans* and her mistranslation of the very simple diagnostic phrase, "siliculis stylo acuminatis" as "the pointed styles" ("MICHaux" diagnosis is very complete, but one characteristic deserves to be remembered, viz. the pointed styles") seriously shake a faith which, I had hoped, could be placed in her precision; and her confidence, from study of a single fragmentary specimen, that *D. arabisans* is a hybrid of *D. aurea* and *D. glabella* (*D. daurica*) as seriously disturbs my high estimate of her scientific judgment.

in

Briefly summarized, the chief diagnostic characters and the geographic ranges of the three plants under discussion are as follows:

*D. AUREA*: Short-lived perennial (sometimes biennial?), with few basal rosettes; stems simple or rarely forking, very leafy, densely stellate-pubescent and pilose; rosette-leaves canescent-pilose; cauline leaves 7-25, oblong- or ovate-lanceolate, with broad sessile bases, pilose; racemes mostly 10-60-flowered, with the lower 4-12 flowers leafy-bracted, in maturity elongating to  $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{4}{5}$  the total height of the plant; sepals pilose; petals golden-yellow; siliques 0.7-2 cm. long, densely pilose, with style 0.5-1.8 mm. long; seeds 30-50, about 1 mm. long. Greenland; northern Labrador; southwestern Ungava (no specimens seen from Hudson Strait); Black Hills and Rocky Mts. See PLATE 296 and MAP 8.

*D. GLABELLA*, var. *TYPICA* (*D. DAURICA*): Suffruticose long-lived perennial, forming extensive mats of rosettes; stems simple or sparsely branched, remotely leafy, minutely stellate-pannose; rosette-leaves minutely stellate-pannose; cauline leaves 0-5, mostly rounded at base, stellate-pilose or glabrate; racemes strictly terminal, long-peduncled, mostly 5-15-flowered and rarely, if ever, elongating to 1/2 the height of the plant; sepals pilose to glabrous; petals white; siliques glabrous or hirtellous, conspicuously veiny or rugose, 6-13 mm. long, with thick style obsolete or up to 0.5 mm. long; seeds 18-36, 0.7-1 mm. long. Arctic and subarctic regions, south to Newfoundland, Quebec, Lake Champlain (a single known station), New York, and shores of Hudson Bay. See PLATES 307 and 308, and MAP 17.

*D. ARABISANS*. Suffruticose long-lived perennial, forming extensive mats of rosettes; stems mostly branching, remotely few-leaved, glabrous or sparingly stellate-pannose; rosette-leaves minutely stellate-pannose or glabrate; cauline leaves 3-12, cuneate or but slightly rounded at base, glabrous or stellate-pannose; racemes strictly terminal, long-peduncled, the primary ones 7-25-flowered, in fruit  $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{3}$  the height of the plant; sepals glabrous or sparsely hirtellous; petals white; siliques glabrous, lustrous and scarcely veiny, 5-15 mm. long, with slender style 0.5-1 mm. long; seeds 12-36, 1.1-1.7 mm. long. St. Lawrence basin and adjacent northern New England, Newfoundland to the Great Lakes. See PLATES 314 and 315 and MAP 21.

*Draba arabisans*, familiar to every botanist who knows its type-region, ledges about Lake Champlain, and the dry slates, schists and

limestones of most of the St. Lawrence basin, has so few traits of the arctic and subarctic *D. aurea* that it is almost unbelievable that any one should have imagined that it has any relationship to that short-lived golden-flowered plant, with leafy-bracted, very elongate racemes, numerous pilose leaves, pilose, mostly simple stems and pilose many-seeded siliques. Is it not apparent, if *D. aurea* ever were, by the most improbable long-distance transfer of pollen, a parent of *D. arabisans*, that something of the habit, pubescence, leafiness and color of flower ought to crop out in the "hybrid"? If such a far-fetched explanation were defensible, should not *D. arabisans* show something of the broad-based caudate leaves of *D. aurea* and of *D. glabella*; should it not occasionally have more ovules and seeds (the maximum number in *D. arabisans* and in *D. glabella* or *D. daurica* being near the minimum in *D. aurea*), and if *D. aurea*, with seeds 1 mm. long, should fortuitously cross with *D. glabella* with even smaller seeds (0.7–1 mm. long), why should their "hybrid" have the seeds consistently larger than in either (1.1–1.7 mm. long)? Furthermore, how was the hypothetical cross accomplished? The northernmost station of *D. arabisans* in the East (there, in the neighborhood of *D. glabella*) is 425 miles (684 km.) from the nearest colony of *D. aurea*; its northwesternmost station even more remote (450 miles or 772 km.) from the nearest *D. aurea* and quite as far from the nearest *D. glabella*. It would have required a relay of more than 400 unswerving and consecrated bees to transfer the requisite single pollen grain; bees are often cited as models for humans, but they have not this degree of altruism!

As to Mrs. Ekman's second proposition, that the Rocky Mountain *Draba praealta* Greene is another hybrid of *D. aurca* and *D. glabella* (*D. daurica*), little need be said. *D. praealta* is a winter-annual or very short-lived perennial of the group with *D. nemorosa*. Its northernmost area is more than 1000 miles (1600 km.) from the nearest *D. glabella* and in no character (except in being a Draba) does it suggest either *D. aurea* or *D. glabella*. It would be quite as sensible to argue that *D. nemorosa* is a hybrid of *D. aurca* and *D. verna*. No one who did so would be taken seriously.

The above cases in *Draba* and *Salix* are very typical of much of the space-filling guess-work which is too often passing as science, vagaries which suggest that when the hybridophile becomes too obsessed he is in danger of becoming the victim of hybridomania. Of such assumptions in case of *Rubus*, Professor L. H. Bailey thus speaks:

We do not elucidate the blackberry problem by the assumption of miscellaneous hybridity as if the species themselves were known and all the puzzles were mixed progeny; our work takes a new direction the moment we cease to invoke crossing as a way of escape from difficulties. The fact that certain forms are puzzling and of doubtful specific validity does not make them hybrids.

Hybrids there may be, but the first effort is to determine the species which are supposed to spawn into mongrels. Hybridity is to be accepted only on evidence; it can not be determined by the examination of usual herbarium specimens. If sexual mixtures in blackberries are as common and widespread as has been imagined, then the systematology of the group is hopeless, as if hybridity were the order of nature and species were minor phenomena.

From his wide experience with *Rubus* under field conditions, Fernald long ago (*Rhodora* xxii, 185) exposed the danger of easily assuming hybridity. The determination of hybridism in *Rubus* is not so simple and easy as one might suppose: consult, for example, the posthumous resumé of the work of Bengt Lidforss in *Zeitschrift für Induktive Abstammungs und Vererbungslehre*, vol. 12, 1-13, Berlin 1914. Note, also, the studies of Crane and Darlington in *Genetica*, ix, 1927.

It is important that the systematic treatment of *Rubus* in North America be kept simple enough so that others than batologists (blackberry particularists, and they usually do not agree among themselves) may be able to use the information; other ways should be found to record the minor variations and to satisfy the insistent urge to nominalize; otherwise, nomenclature loses its utility.

Perhaps *Rubus* is one of those genera, as Bacigalupi has recently said of *Cuphea* (*Gray Herb. Contr.* xcv.) "whose many technicalities render it particularly fitting that it be left in the hands of a specialist."<sup>1</sup>

Along a similar line of reasoning, Professor Einar Du Rietz, discussing the attitude of "the Swedish school of salicologists," says:

if I have not misunderstood FLODERUS' recent papers, many of his species never form pure populations of any extension, those species thus being known only as single individuals or very small populations accidentally found here and there in the highly polymorphic syngameons classed by FLODERUS as hybrids. In those cases it may well be asked whether we are not on a dangerous road that may easily lead to complete dissolution of any practically applicable species-concept in those populations.

This method of treatment, of course, involves the theory that the species distinguished are the primary units and the main population classed as hybrids is younger than those. This, however, is not proved. It appears quite possible that the smaller and more uniform populations classed as species are secondary units differentiated from the highly polymorphic syngameon classed as a complex of hybrids, or even only extreme forms accidentally appearing, disappearing and reappearing within this syngameon. In such a highly polymorphic syngameon any form of sufficient vitality may simulate a primary species if isolated, and to some extent even if not isolated.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bailey, *Gentes Herb.* ii. 272, 273 (1932).

<sup>2</sup> Du Rietz, *Svensk Bot. Tidskr.* xxiv. 381, 382 (1930).

In our *Draba* population of northeastern America hybridization doubtless sometimes occurs, but, just as in most of our groups of vascular plants, the hybrids are quite obvious to those who are familiar with the true species. They do not make up a significant element in the flora, and, being chiefly sterile, they are taxonomically insignificant. The constant and freely fertile plants of definite and highly characteristic ranges surely are not demonstrated hybrids of taxonomically unrelated and geographically remote parents. In groups like *Draba*, mostly dependent on insect-pollination, "absent-treatment" hybrids must be demonstrated before they can be accepted.

In getting at types, some of which have not been discussed by others, I have met with universal kindness and courtesy. The most generous sending by Prof. Milbraed from Berlin of the actual type of *Draba Henneana* Schlechtendal has been noted. Similarly, with his well known liberality Sir William Wright Smith, Director and Regius Professor, has sent me from the Royal Botanic Garden at Edinburgh the type of *D. crassifolia* Graham. Mr. Ramsbottom and Mr. Exell, as noted, have supplied a photograph of and very detailed notes on the type of *D. glabella* Pursh preserved at the British Museum. Dr. Becherer and Mr. Macbride have sent as a gift photographs of and critical notes on four types of species described in DeCandolle's *Systema*. To all these gentlemen I here express my keen appreciation of their courtesies and aid.

In the present study, in which the problems have chiefly concerned plants of eastern Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador, I have been able to supplement the 892 sheets from this area in the Gray Herbarium and the herbarium of the New England Botanical Club with the remarkable collection in the National Herbarium of Canada, a collection made doubly valuable on account of the beautiful material from the shores of Hudson Straits and Hudson Bay secured by the late Dr. Malte and put at my disposal by Dr. R. M. Anderson. I have, furthermore, had the great advantage of receiving as a loan through Brother Marie-Victorin the invaluable collections of specimens of the Province of Quebec belonging to himself and to the University of Montreal. I have also, through the kindness of Drs. Merrill and Gleason, been able to study the material of the New York Botanical Garden and to borrow for closer examination many critical specimens. To all the gentlemen who have thus put irreplaceable collections at my disposal I extend my sincere thanks.

In view of the difficulty of the group and the admittedly tentative classification of it, at certain points, it has seemed important to illustrate very fully the more technical species, especially those which have been misinterpreted. Much obscurity and misunderstanding would have been avoided in the past if proper illustrations had accompanied the original descriptions of all species of the genus. The photographs have been most carefully and generously made by my life-long friend and a co-editor of *RHODORA*, Professor J. FRANKLIN COLLINS, the expenses of the photography and the making of the blocks met in part through the Wyeth Fund of the Division of Biology of Harvard University, in part through the Milton Fund for Research of Harvard University. With his accustomed great generosity and encouragement of accurate illustration, another friend of many years, who has aided me in the collection of many of the cited specimens, Mr. BAYARD LONG, has assumed the entire cost of reproduction of the half-tone blocks.

**SYNOPSIS OF DRABA IN TEMPERATE EASTERN NORTH AMERICA**  
(east of the Great Plains and Hudson Bay)

- a. Petals rounded or emarginate at summit: flowering stems with 1 or more leaves above the basal rosette, or, if scapose, with perennial bases, mostly branching caudices and marcescent remnants of old leaves along the caudices below the rosettes....*b.*
- b.* Flowering stem a slender scape (very exceptionally with a basal leaf or bract), including the mature raceme 0.1–1 (rarely –2) dm. high, rising from a basal rosette: rosettes solitary to numerous, at the summits of short crowns or of elongate branches or branchlets of the caudex; leaves of the rosette 0.3–2 cm. long, 1–5 mm. wide: siliques 2.7–9 (very rarely –10) mm. long. (Very exceptional specimens under the next "*b*" might be sought here)....*c.*
- c.* Leaves and scapes bearing simple or elongate and forking (as well as sometimes sessile and stellate) trichomes, or leaves merely ciliate or even glabrous....*d.*
- d.* Leaves conspicuously villous-ciliate: rachis and pedicels copiously villous-hirsute: sepals ovate to rounded-oblong, 1.5–3 mm. broad, villous-hirsute, rarely glabrous: petals yellow, 3.5–5.5 mm. long, 2.5–4 mm. broad: anthers 0.5–0.7 mm. long: seeds 1.3–1.5 mm. long.....1. *D. alpina*.
- d.* Leaves stiffly short-ciliate or eciliate: rachis and pedicels glabrous, short-hirtellous or stellate-tomentulose: sepals oblong, 0.5–1.8 mm. broad, glabrous or sparsely short-pubescent: petals white or becoming white in age, 2–5 mm. long, 1–4.5 mm. broad: anthers 0.2–0.5 mm. long: seeds 0.7–1.5 mm. long.....*e.*
- e.* Midribs of leaves becoming firm and prominent beneath, persisting as crowded subulate remains

on the multicarpital caudices: scapes and pedicels glabrous or essentially so.

Expanding leaves with more or less stellate or furcate pubescence on the surface near the tips: sepals broad-oblong, 1.2–1.8 mm. broad; petals 3.5–5 mm. long, 2–4.5 mm. broad; anthers 0.5 mm. long; siliques oblong to narrowly ovate, 5–10 mm. long, 2–3.5 mm. broad; valves only obscurely or scarcely reticulate; septum without conspicuous median fold; seeds 16–20, often apiculate, 1–1.5 mm. long.

..... 2. *D. fladnizensis*, var. *heterotrichia*.

Expanding leaves with glabrous surfaces: sepals narrowly oblong, 0.5–1 mm. broad; petals 2–3 mm. long, 1–2 mm. broad; anthers 0.2 mm. long; siliques oblong-lanceolate, 2.7–7 mm. long, 1–2 mm. broad; valves reticulate-veiny; septum with broad median fold; seeds 10–16, rarely apiculate, 0.7–1.1 mm. long ..... 3. *D. Allenii*.

e. Midribs soft and evanescent: old leaves soon wilting, if persistent remaining as marcescent shreds, not as subulate remnants.

Perennial with multicarpital caudex and long-persistent shreds of old leaves: leaves hispid with simple and variously forking trichomes; scape, rachis and pedicels hirtellous with simple or forking trichomes ..... 4. *D. rupestris*.

Short-lived perennial (sometimes biennial or annual?), with simple or but slightly branching caudex: leaves glabrous, rarely sparsely ciliate; scape, rachis and pedicels glabrous or scape sparsely hirtellous only at base ..... 5. *D. crassifolia*.

c. Leaves and scapes canescent-pannose with minute stellate trichomes, simple elongate trichomes wanting or very sparse.

Leaves cuneate-obovate to broadly lanceolate, obtuse; siliques glabrous; style 0.3–0.4 mm. long; seeds 14–28, 0.7–1 mm. long ..... 6. *D. nivalis*.

Leaves linear or linear-ob lanceolate, acute; siliques stellate-hirtellous; style 0.8–1 mm. long; seeds 8–10, 1.2–1.8 mm. long ..... 7. *D. Peasei*.

b. Flowering stem with 1–many leaves above the basal rosette, 1 cm.–5 dm. high; basal leaves in the perennial species 0.5–9 cm. long, 0.1–1.8 cm. broad; siliques 0.25–2 cm. long. (Very exceptional specimens of nos. 1–7 might be sought here) .... f.

f. Perennial, or nos. 8–10 biennial, with often branching caudex, the branches commonly terminating in rosettes of leaves: the biennial often simple-crowned nos. 8–10 very leafy (leaves 7–95) and with racemes often leafy-bracted at base ..... g.

g. Flowering stem simple or with erect or strongly ascending branches: leaves entire or toothed, rarely laciniate; style many times shorter than the siliques, at most 1.8 mm. long; seeds 10–50, 0.7–1.4 (rarely 1.7) mm. long ... h.

h. Petals deep yellow (fading in drying): cauline leaves of principal flowering stem 7–25; ovaries and siliques densely pilose; siliques lanceolate to linear-oblong, 0.7–2 cm. long, usually twisted.

Lower 4–12 flowers of the primary raceme commonly subtended by leafy bracts: pedicels erect, the lowest 5–15 mm. long in fruit. .... 8. *D. aurea*.

Lower flowers bractless, the lowermost only rarely subtended: pedicels spreading to arched-ascending, the lowest only 2–4 mm. long in fruit. .... 9. *D. minganensis*.

*h.* Petals white: caudine leaves 1–95: ovaries and siliques glabrous or variously short-pubescent; siliques linear-lanceolate to ovate or short-oblong, 2.5–12 (rarely–15) mm. long, if strongly twisted and more than 12 mm. long, glabrous or minutely stellate-tomentulose. .... *i.*

*i.* Biennial (rarely slightly perennial by brief persistence of basal offshoots): lower leaves of the rosettes shriveling soon after anthesis, the rosette-leaves not strongly contrasting with the lower caudine: the subspherical rosette of the 1st year loosening and elongating to form the very leafy (up to 50, rarely to 95, leaves) flowering stem: axis of raceme and pedicels densely pilose-tomentulose to villous with simple or forking hairs or with both intermixed. .... 10. *D. incana*.

*i.* Perennial, with branches of the caudex usually invested below with fibrous shreds of old leaves: new basal rosettes usually well developed at flowering time; their leaves unlike the caudine foliage: axis of raceme and pedicels glabrous, sparsely hirtellous or stellate-pubescent. .... *j.*

*j.* Foliage with all or many of its trichomes simple or elongate and irregularly forking, with or without admixed sessile or subsessile regularly stellate hairs. .... *k.*

*k.* Leaves glabrous except for sparsely ciliate margins, membranaceous, becoming translucent and conspicuously veiny (by transmitted light) in drying: plant otherwise glabrous except for hirtellous sepals: pedicels 4–10 mm. long, the lower nearly equaling the oblong-lanceolate siliques. .... 11. *D. Sornborgeri*.

*k.* Leaves hirtellous to stellate-pubescent, firm, opaque: stems hirsute at least on the lower internodes: pedicels 0.5–7 (rarely–10) mm. long, mostly much shorter than the elliptic, oblong or lanceolate siliques. .... *l.*

*l.* Foliage with numerous simple or elongate and furcate trichomes: rosette-leaves linear-oblanceolate to narrowly spatulate or narrowly obovate, 1–6 mm. broad: mature fruiting stems 0.1–2.5 dm. high, with 1 (rarely 0)–13 (average 6) leaves: sepals 0.4–1.5 mm. broad: petals 3–4.2 mm. long: primary fruiting racemes 1/3–6/7 the full height of the plant: seeds 14–28.

Caudine leaves ovate, 3–10 mm. broad: sepals 1.8–2.6 mm. long, 1–1.5 mm. broad: petals 2–3 mm. broad: siliques oblong or oblong-lanceolate, 2–3.8 mm.

broad; the lowest on pedicels 1–5 mm. long..... 12. *D. norvegica*.

Cauline leaves linear-lanceolate to narrowly ovate, 1.5–6 mm. broad: sepals 1.6–2 mm. long, 0.4–0.9 mm. broad: petals 1–1.5 mm. broad: siliques linear to linear-lanceolate, 2–2.5 mm. broad; the lowest on pedicels 4–10 mm. long..... 13. *D. clivicola*.

*l.* Foliage with numerous stellate and several to few simple and elongate trichomes; rosette-leaves cuneate-ob lanceolate, 4–9 mm. broad: mature fruiting stems 1–3.5 dm. high, with (3) 6–25 (average 10) leaves: sepals 1.3–2.3 mm. broad: petals 4.5–5 mm. long: primary fruiting racemes  $\frac{1}{4}$ – $\frac{1}{2}$  the full height of the plant: seeds 20–40..... 14. *D. laurentiana*.

*j.* Foliage with close stellate pubescence forming, at least on the expanding leaves, a pannose coat, simple trichomes wanting or only rarely occurring (except as cilia) on the rosette-leaves.... *m.*

*m.* Siliques plump, ovoid, ellipsoid or oblong, 2.5–10 mm. long, glabrous: sepals 1.5–2 mm. long, 1 mm. broad: seeds closely but irregularly imbricated, often turned oblique to the septum..... 15. *D. pycnosperma*.

*m.* Siliques strongly flattened (plump only in no. 18, with densely tomentulose valves), ovate to lanceolate or linear, 5–15 mm. long, glabrous or pubescent: sepals 2–3.5 mm. long, 1–2.3 mm. broad: seeds not imbricated, lying flat against the septum..... *n.*

*n.* Siliques glabrous or only sparsely hirtellous or scabrous, strongly flattened: racemes usually bractless.... *o.*

*o.* Cauline leaves mostly rounded at base, oblong, ovate or obovate: mature siliques usually definitely veiny, flattish, plane or only slightly twisted: style obsolete or thick and short (up to 0.5 mm. long): fruiting pedicels stoutish, short; the lowest 1–6 (rarely –8) mm. long.  
Stems hirsute, especially on lower internodes, with abundant simple divergent trichomes over-topping the stellate hairs: cauline leaves (3) 6–25 (average 10)..... 14. *D. laurentiana*.  
Stems closely stellate-pannose, sparsely or not at all hirsute on lowest internodes: cauline leaves 1 (rarely 0)–8, rarely–14 (average 4)..... 16. *D. glabella*.

*o.* Cauline leaves narrowed or only slightly rounded at base, oblanceolate, oblong or narrowly obovate: mature siliques scarcely or only obscurely veiny, often-

est twisted, sometimes flat, very thin: style slender, 0.5–1 mm. long: fruiting pedicels slender; the lowest 3–15 mm. long: stems glabrous or minutely stellate-pubescent ..... 17. *D. arabisans.*

n. Siliques densely stellate-tomentulose, only slightly compressed, hardly flat: racemes usually leafy-bracted at base ..... 18. *D. lanceolata.*

g. Flowering stem with strongly divergent branches: leaves laciniate or subpectinate: style filiform, 1.5–3 mm. long,  $\frac{1}{4}$ – $\frac{1}{3}$  as long as the spirally twisted stellate-pubescent siliques: seeds 7–15, 1.2–1.8 mm. long ..... 19. *D. ramosissima.*

f. Annuals, winter-annuals or biennials, with bractless racemes: flowering stems leafy or with at least 1 pair of leaves above the basal rosette. . . . p.

p. Siliques 1.7–6 mm. long, 6–16-seeded: petals (when developed) 2–3 mm. long: stems simple, or branching nearly to summit, with the numerous small leaves strigose with variously forking trichomes.

Stems with abbreviated corymbiform branches from the middle and upper axils: siliques linear-ellipsoid, 4–6 mm. long, minutely stellate-puberulent: seeds 1–1.5 mm. long ..... 20. *D. aprica.*

Stems mostly with elongate or leafy branches (or simple): siliques oblong-ellipsoid, 1.7–5 mm. long, glabrous: seeds 0.5–0.8 mm. long ..... 21. *D. brachycarpa.*

p. Siliques 5–18 mm. long, 15–80-seeded: petals (when well developed) 2–5 mm. long: stem simple or forking only below, hispid, at least below, like the leaves.

Flowers uniform, with yellowish (finally whitish) narrowly cuneate petals about 2 mm. long: leaves scattered nearly to the slender and elongate racemes: siliques 3–13 mm. long ..... 22. *D. nemorosa.*

Flowers heteromorphic, some with broad white petals 3.5–5 mm. long, others with reduced petals, others apetalous and cleistogamous: leaves mostly near the base: flowering stems and branches sub-scapiform: racemes comparatively short and thick: siliques 6–18 mm. long.

Leaves obviously dentate, hispid with stipitate and sessile forking trichomes: fruiting raceme elongate, its rachis and pedicels pubescent. 23. *D. cuneifolia.*

Leaves entire or only obscurely dentate, hirsut-ciliate with simple trichomes, stellate-pubescent on the lower surface: fruiting raceme short and umbelliform, its rachis and pedicels glabrous. 24. *D. reptans.*

a. Petals deeply cleft: annuals or winter-annuals: flowering stems naked scapes arising from basal rosettes. . . . 25. *D. verna.*

(To be continued)

### PAST PERIODS OF EELGRASS SCARCITY<sup>1</sup>

CLARENCE COTTAM

FRAGMENTARY bits of evidence have been obtained which clearly indicate that there have been past periods of eelgrass (*Zostera marina*)

<sup>1</sup> Published with aid to RHODORA from the National Academy of Sciences.

scarcity, probably however not to be compared in intensity or completeness with the present catastrophe. In the Shooting Journal of George Henry Mackay from 1865 to 1922,<sup>1</sup> page 351, he records under date of March 18, 1894, "There is a great scarcity of shellfish food in this locality [Muskeget Island, Massachusetts] at present, and large quantities (acres) of the eelgrass on which the Brant feed have been killed during the past winter. Still there is a good deal left." So far as the writer has yet found, this is the only published record of an exact date when there was a scarcity of the plant; however, from many places along the coast, old time hunters or fishermen have been met who recall a time, "years ago," or "about 40 years ago," or "nearly 50 years ago," or "about 25 years ago," etc., when the plant partially or largely died out in a given section. At Penobscot Bay, Maine, a fisherman told of a time "about 40 years ago" when practically all the "grass" disappeared in the bay so that several years elapsed before it was again abundant. Forty years back would place the date in the winter of 1893-94.

Further corroborative evidence that the eelgrass was greatly reduced along much of our Atlantic coast at about this same time is contained in a letter received from Mr. H. E. Perkins of Shelter Island, New York. Mr. Perkins reported that he has records (including those of his father and others) covering a period of 80 years. Under date of January 17, 1933, he wrote that in 1894 at Penobscot, Maine, on the northern branch of the Bagaduce River ". . . the mud flats were smooth with no grass on them, but from then on the grass kept growing longer and thicker until it got so you could not row a boat through it." He further writes, "Last year [winter of 1931-32] here [New York coast] it died out as it did in most places along the Atlantic coast. As a boy I talked with the old residents about the eelgrass dying out and they told me that about 1854 . . . (it) . . . died but grew again. According to my own observation and that of others, the eelgrass in this particular part of Maine coast has died out three times in the last eighty years."

Other evidence strongly suggests that the winter of 1893-94 was one in which the eelgrass was more or less diminished along much of the coast. A guide from the Honga River Gunning Club on the Chesapeake, Dorchester County, Maryland, remarked that the eelgrass died out almost completely in his section "about 40 years ago" (1893-94) and that it was "several years" in returning. A similar account was received from a gunner on Grassy Bay, New Jersey.

Reports from different sections indicate that somewhere about 1908 there was also a subnormal growth of the plant at least over a considerable portion of the New England coast. State Warden Babson of Newburyport, Massachusetts, spoke of a serious diminution of the plant at the mouth of the Merrimac River and a fish warden from Portland, Maine, mentioned a similar scarcity over much of that coast at about that same time (1908).

<sup>1</sup> Edited and printed privately by Dr. John C. Phillips. The Cosmos Press, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.

From a number of sources it seems evident that there have been local periods of scarcity at many places along the Atlantic seaboard. Many of these reports were indefinite as to date. Mr. William Harrison, a member of the Maryland Game Commission, informed me that in 1889 (at the time of the Johnstown flood) the eelgrass almost died out in the Chesapeake area and that it was upwards of 25 years before the maximum growth had returned. Two fishermen at Cape Cod, Massachusetts, stated that the eelgrass was noticeably scarce in Paponesset Bay 18 years ago (1915). Supt. Geo. Snook of the Haynes-Laster Game Preserve, Portsmouth Island, North Carolina, informed me that there was a noticeable reduction in the eelgrass crop in Pamlico Sound in 1917. A crop report from France indicates that 1913<sup>1</sup> was a year in which but little eelgrass was produced, and that in consequence the price nearly doubled.

A number of fishermen and coastal sportsmen reported that while there never before was a time of such widespread eelgrass scarcity as now, in one or more years the supply has been much below normal. Such reports of scarcity were heard along all sections of our coast. Many, and perhaps the majority of coastal sportsmen and fishermen, maintain that there has always been at least a fair supply of eelgrass. The above information, though fragmentary, seems to point to the fact that in the memory of man there has been no period of scarcity at all comparable with the present one. The fact, however, that there have been periods of marked reduction gives considerable encouragement to the hope that this period of serious diminution will gradually pass.

The present eelgrass catastrophe abruptly became evident and widespread along most of the North American coast in 1931 and 1932, with some evidence of the trouble in a few restricted localities late in 1930. It seems that in midsummer of 1931, in most localities from North Carolina to New England, the leaves of the eelgrass became somewhat darkened, broke from their roots, and washed ashore in great windrows. Before that summer was over, less than one percent of a normal stand of the plant existed in most affected areas.

The Canadian coast south of the Gulf of St. Lawrence was denuded by the fall of 1932 and when the ice cleared away in the spring of 1933 practically the entire area of the plant's regular range in that region was 99 percent devastated.

Most of the European coast from the Mediterranean to Sweden is known to be similarly affected. The disease appeared first along the French coast during the winter season of 1931-32 and rapidly spread from that point. Our Pacific coast appears to be unaffected.

A recent survey of the Atlantic coast shows a most perplexing condition. Some areas have made a definite progressive improvement since the first onslaught of the disease; others have produced a new growth only to be laid waste a short time later, while still other

<sup>1</sup> Daily Consular and Trade Reports, June 30, 1914, No. 152, pp. 1988-1990, Dept. of Commerce. The Seaweed Industry of France.

sections have grown progressively worse until practically every plant has been destroyed. With a few exceptions, those areas with a reduced salinity are making the best return, notable among these are portions of Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, Shinnecock Bay and Mecox Bay, Long Island, New York, and Swanquarter, North Carolina. Areas that show little or no improvement include Woods Hole, Massachusetts, South Oyster Bay, Long Island, New York., and portions of the more open and salty bays of New Jersey. Considering our entire (Atlantic U. S.) coast as a unit there appears to be some improvement although it is altogether too soon to predict what the future of the eelgrass will be.<sup>1</sup>

#### SUMMARY

1. From available evidence the eelgrass largely disappeared over the major portion of our Atlantic coast in 1893 and 1894 and it required several years before it had come back to normal abundance.

2. At least in the New England section a subnormal crop seems to have been produced in 1908.

3. Evidence clearly indicates that there have been a number of local periods of eelgrass scarcity along the American Atlantic and European coasts.

4. In most sections the present catastrophe became abruptly evident in 1931 and 1932 with some evidence late in 1930; on the European coast, which is seriously affected, the malady was noticed first in France in the winter of 1931-32.

5. The eelgrass at present shows a perplexing condition; some areas show improvement while others do not.

6. It is much too soon to predict what the future of the eelgrass will be, although the fact that there were previous periods of scarcity or limited production of the plant, offers some encouragement to the hope that the malady will gradually pass.

UNITED STATES BIOLOGICAL SURVEY,

Washington, D. C.

---

#### A NEW VARIETY OF GLYCERIA GRANDIS AND A KEY TO ITS ALLIED SPECIES<sup>2</sup>

LEON KELSO

WHILE studying the new form of *Glyceria grandis* here described the writer had occasion to note the distinguishing characters of the allied species in northwest America and all Asia. Since no key has hitherto

<sup>1</sup> A number of short papers have appeared dealing with the recent eelgrass scarcity. As examples see Taylor, W. R., RHODORA, Vol. 35, pp 152-154 and 186; also see Cottam, C. Plant Disease Reporter, Vol. 17, No. 6, pp 46-53.

<sup>2</sup> Published with aid to RHODORA from the National Academy of Sciences.

been published of all these together, and because of the difficulty of the group, the following is offered.

- a. Lemma distinctly 7-nerved . . . . b.
- b. Second glume more than 2.9 mm. long . . . . c.
- c. Second glume nearly equaling the lowest lemma above it, but little longer than the first glume . . . . *G. paludifrons* Komarov.
- c. Second glume not nearly equaling the lowest lemma above it,  $\frac{1}{5}$  or more longer than the first glume . . . . d.
- d. Panicle not drooping; all nerves of lemma except two outermost reaching to near apex; stems not decumbent at base . . . . e.
- e. Branches of panicle not widely spreading, or, if widely spreading, the spikelets green and 7- or fewer-flowered . . . . f.
- f. Lemma firm, 3–4 mm. long, obtuse or truncate at apex; second glume moderately acutish; sheaths not numerously and conspicuously septate.
- G. maxima* (Hartm.) Holmb.
- f. Lemma thin, 3.8–4.5 mm. long, acutish at apex; second glume strongly acutish; sheaths numerously and conspicuously septate . . . . *G. leptolepis* Ohwi.
- e. Branches of panicle at length widely spreading; spikelets 7–10-flowered; lemma entirely purple.
- G. grandis* var. *Komarovii*.
- d. Panicle drooping; only midnerve of lemma reaching to apex; stems decumbent at base . . . . *G. alnasteretum* Komarov.
- b. Second glume less than 2.9 mm. long . . . . g.
- g. Lemma less than 4.2 mm. long; sheaths not numerously and conspicuously septate and not closely clasping stem . . . . h.
- h. Lemma not both pale green and papillose-scabrous under a lens, and not dentate at apex; stems not decumbent at base, except in *G. lithuanica* and rarely in *G. grandis* . . . . i.
- i. Lemma not broadly scarious-margined . . . . j.
- j. Panicle, at least in upper half, drooping . . . . k.
- k. Lemma 3–4 mm. long, not concave at apex; second glume 1.5–2 mm. long; stems decumbent at base . . . . l.
- l. Spikelets greenish . . . . *G. lithuanica* (Gorski) Lindman.
- l. Spikelets purplish . . . . *G. lithuanica* f. *violacea* Neumann.
- k. Lemmas 2.2 mm. long or less, concave at apex; second glume 1.5 mm. or less long; stems not decumbent at base . . . . *G. striata* var. *stricula* (Scribn.) Fernald.
- j. Panicle not drooping in upper half . . . . m.
- m. Panicle less than 15 cm. long; lemma with nerves excurrent at apex . . . . *G. natans* Komarov.
- m. Panicle more than 15 cm. long; nerves of lemma not excurrent at apex . . . . n.
- n. Spikelets 5–7 mm. long, 5–7-flowered . . . . *G. grandis* S. Wats.
- n. Spikelets 7–10 mm. long, 7–10-flowered.
- G. grandis* var. *Komarovii* (intermediate forms).
- i. Lemma broadly scarious-margined . . . . o.
- o. Panicle more than 18 cm. long; branches not nodding; stem stout and rigid . . . . *G. arundinacea* (Bieb.) Kunth.
- o. Panicle less than 18 cm. long; its branches nodding; stem slender . . . . p.
- p. Panicle not decidedly nodding; glumes obovate, finely erose; stem erect . . . . *G. pulchella* (Nash) K. Schum.
- p. Panicle decidedly nodding; glumes ovate, entire; stem decumbent . . . . *G. lithuanica* (Gorski) Lindman.

- h.* Lemma pale green, shiny, papillose-scabrous under a lens and dentate at apex; stems decumbent or creeping at base. . . . . *g.*
- g.* Stems with branches at lower nodes; lemma 3–4 mm. long. . . . . *G. viridis* Honda.
- g.* Stems not branched at lower nodes; lemma 2–3 mm. long. . . . . *G. pallida* (Torr.) Trin.
- g.* Lemma 3.8–4.5 mm. long; sheaths numerously and conspicuously septate and closely clasping stem. . . . . *G. leptolepis* Ohwi.
- a.* Lemma 5-nerved. . . . . *G. pauciflora* Presl.

GLYCERIA GRANDIS var. **Komarovii**, var. nov., spiculis 7–10 mm. longis, 8–10-floris; lemmatibus 2.8–3.5 mm. longis.—Spikelets and lemmas larger, deep rich purple; sheaths strongly purple-tinged, otherwise similar to the species, into which it intergrades. YUKON TERRITORY: Dawson, July 17–19, 1909, A. S. Hitchcock no. 4362 (TYPE in U. S. Nat. Herb.); White Horse, July 14, 1909, A. S. Hitchcock no. 4361½. ALASKA: Fairbanks, open swamp along road, Aug. 2–10, 1909, A. S. Hitchcock no. 4596; Salcha Slough, June 24, 1922, O. J. Murie no. 309.

I take pleasure in naming this plant after Dr. V. L. Komarov, who has done more than any other to clear up the taxonomy of the Asiatic members of the genus *Glyceria*.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

### THREE INTERESTING NEW PLANTS FROM WALLOWA COUNTY, OREGON<sup>1</sup>

M. E. PECK

THE northeast corner of Oregon, which includes the Wallowa Mts. and the western wall of the Snake River Canyon, has yielded a large number of interesting endemic species, and its resources in this particular are apparently not yet exhausted. During the past season (1933) the writer spent a month collecting in this section of Oregon, which is no less remarkable for the richness of its flora than for the magnificence of its scenery. The three following species were among the botanical rarities secured.

BOLANDRA *imnahaensis*, sp. nov., caule e rhizomate parvo bulbulis circumdato, gracile infermo erecto vel languescente 2.5–5 dm. alto glanduloso-puberulo; foliis reniformibus tenuibus fere glabris, infimis 3–7 cm. latis in petiolis 2–2.5 cm. longis 5–7-sectis, lobis paucidentatis dentibus rotundis vel acutis, foliis caulinis inferioribus brevипetiolatis stipulis magnis foliosis, superioribus sessilibus amplectentibus profunde dentatis; floribus multis laxe paniculatis in pedicellis

<sup>1</sup> Published with aid to RHODORA from the National Academy of Sciences.

longis filiformibus; calyce 10–14 mm. longo tubo brevi-cylindraceo in fructu haud urceolare breviore quam lobis longo-acuminatis; petalis longioribus quam lobis calycis acuminatis a basi valde nervosis obscure rubescentibus; filamentis circiter 3 mm. exsertis; stylis paullum filamenta excedentibus; carpellis maturis circiter 1 mm. conjunctis. **TYPE Peck 17495**, wet wall of a small canyon along the Imnaha River, 3 mi. above Imnaha, Wallowa Co., July 4, 1933.

The genus *Bolandra* includes, in addition to the present, two rare local species of the western United States, *B. californica* Gray, of the Sierras and *B. oregana* Wats., of the Columbia Gorge and lower Willamette Valley. *B. imnahaensis* is more nearly related to the latter, from which it differs, among other characters, in the more numerous flowers, the narrower calyx-tube not becoming urceolate, and in the nearly separate carpels.

**SAXIFRAGA incompta**, sp. nov., caulinis e stolonibus inconspicuis brevibusque foliis minutis spathulatis tectis, plerumque solitariis erectis simplicibus vel ramosis 3–7 cm. altis minute glandulosopubescentibus; foliis ad basin confertis, his spathulatis vel obovatis in petiolum incertum contractis 2–3-lobatis vel infimis integris, lobis obtusis vel rotundis, foliis caulinis paucis angustis omnibus glandulosopuberulis et paullum ciliatis; floribus paucis laxe cymosis; tubo calycis campanulato vel fere hemispherico cum ovario ad summum coalescenti 2.5–3 mm. alto, lobis purpurascensibus erectis ovatis obtusis 1.5 mm. longis; petalis 3–3.5 mm. longis anguste obovatis vix ungulatis albis 3-nervatis; filamentis anguste subulatis paullum brevioribus lobis calycis; stylis brevissimis erectis in stigmata spathulata dilatatis; seminibus minimis numerosis.—**TYPE Peck 18034**, moist north slope of Peet's Point, Wallowa Co., July 29, 1933.

A small inconspicuous species but of particular interest on account of its close relationship to *S. Nuttallii* Small (*Cascadia Nuttallii* Johnson), comprising the second known species of this section, or if we accept Johnson's segregation, of the genus *Cascadia*.

**RUBUS Bartonianus** sp. nov., frutex erectus ramosissimus cortice conciso, ramulis gracilibus badiis minute puberulis; foliis 3–5 cm. longis late ovatis vel orbiculatis plus minusve profunde cordatis 3–5-sectis, lobis acute incisis dentatis supra glabris subtus minute puberulis; floribus solitariis numerosis; lobis calycis 1–1.5 cm. longis abrupte longo-acuminatis vel interdum foliaceis dentatisque; petalis late obovatis albis circiter 2 cm. longis; stylis dense pubescentibus; fructu nigro-rubescente vel purpurascente depresso-hemispherico 1 cm. lato.—**TYPE Peck 17611**, margin of Snake River Canyon, Wallowa Co., Ore., opposite Hell Canyon, Idaho, July 12, 1933.

The writer first became acquainted with this extremely interesting shrub through fragments sent by Mrs. Ralph Barton, of Wallowa Co.,

about two years ago. It was then tentatively determined as *R. deliciosus* James, its nearest relative known to us, and apparently confined to Colorado. Specimens collected in July of the current year (1933) proved, on careful comparison with a series of specimens from the Rocky Mountain Herbarium, kindly loaned by Dr. Aven Nelson, to represent a clearly distinct species. *R. Bartonianus* differs from *R. deliciosus* in the erect habit, the more slender, much less pubescent twigs, the absence of distinct hairiness on twigs and leaves, and very conspicuously in the form of the leaves. These for the most part are broadly ovate instead of prevailingly orbicular-reniform, and sharply cleft and irregularly dentate in contrast to the broad shallow sinuses and broad rounded lobes with evenly serrate-dentate margins of the leaves of the Rocky Mountain plant. It is a pleasure to dedicate this fine species to its real discoverer.

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY,  
Salem, Oregon

---

THE SYNONYMY OF *PHYLLANTHUS BRASILIENSIS*.—*Phyllanthus brasiliensis* (Aubl.) Poir. is the correct author-citation for the well known fish-poison which has passed in literature and herbaria as *P. Conami* Sw., *P. acuminatus* Vahl, or *P. brasiliensis* Muell. Arg. Poiret, Swartz and Mueller Argoviensis based their names on *Conami brasiliensis* of Aublet, published in 1775, while Vahl's name, though based on a different type, is generally admitted to be conspecific with the others.

For some reason, probably the misidentification of specimens by Poiret, Mueller Argoviensis refused to recognize Poiret's combination as valid, referred it to another species, and made the same combination again on the same basis but in his own name. This action doubtless is responsible for the neglect of Poiret's name by later botanists.

The essential literature is as follows:

*PHYLLANTHUS BRASILIENSIS* (Aubl.) Poir. Encycl. v. 296 (1804). *Conami brasiliensis* Aubl. Guyan. ii. 926, iv. t. 354 (1775). *Phyllanthus Conami* Sw. Prodr. 28 (1788). *P. acuminatus* Vahl, Symb. Bot. ii. 95 (1791). *P. brasiliensis* Muell. Arg. in DC. Prod. xv. pt. 2, 383 (1866).—L. B. SMITH, Gray Herbarium.

Volume 36, no. 426, including pages 197-240 and plates 286-289, was issued 1 June, 1934.

## NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Subscription revenue covers less than one-half the total cost of publication of RHODORA. The strictest economy will be necessary to permit future publication on the same modest scale as has obtained in recent years.

About one-third of our subscribers file their renewal orders through commercial subscription agencies which habitually deduct 10% from every remittance as a commission.

Many remittances reach the management in the form of drafts or checks which are subject to bank collection and exchange charges of varying amounts, owing to Clearing House rules.

Beginning January 1, 1932, the subscription rate to RHODORA will be \$2.00 *net* per annum payable in Boston or New York funds or their equivalent (i. e. drafts or postal money orders which are collectible in Boston at par). All subscription orders from agencies must be accompanied by remittances at the *net* rate without deduction. Hence all subscribers who require the convenience of agency service must regard the subscription rate to RHODORA as \$2.00, plus the charges of agents.

## NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

In accordance with the Editorial Announcement of March, 1931, that RHODORA will follow the provision of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, that the publication of names of new groups will be valid only when they are accompanied by a Latin diagnosis, contributors are notified to see that all new species or other groups proposed by them for publication in RHODORA have Latin diagnoses. If desired by contributors, the Editorial Board of RHODORA will undertake (with charges at cost for matter of considerable length) to have their English diagnoses converted into Latin.

## DUPLICATE BOOKS FOR SALE

<b>Barnes, C. R.</b>	Analytic Keys to the Genera and Species of North American Mosses. Revised and extended by F. DeF. Heald. 212 p. Madison. 1896. Unbound.....	\$ 2.00
<b>Druery, C. T.</b>	British Ferns and their Varieties. Cloth. 8 vo. 458 p. 40 colored plates, 96 nature prints, 319 figs. London. 1910.....	\$ 2.00
<b>Hooker, W. J.</b>	Exotic Flora containing figures and descriptions of new, rare, or otherwise interesting Exotic Plants, especially of such as are deserving of being cultivated in our gardens. 3 vols. 232 colored plates. Large 8 vo., cloth (binding of 2 plates partly broken). Edinburgh. 1823-27.....	\$ 20.00
<b>Mohr, C.</b>	Plant Life of Alabama. An account of the distribution, modes of associations and adaptations of the Flora of Alabama, together with a systematic catalogue of the plants growing in the State. Alabama ed. Montgomery. 8 vo., 1901, pp. 921.....	\$ 3.00

Prices do not include cost of transportation.

Address Librarian,  
GRAY HERBARIUM of HARVARD UNIVERSITY,  
Cambridge, Mass.

## Early Volumes of Rhodora

A limited number of the earlier volumes can still be supplied. Libraries and other subscribers needing to complete their sets should communicate with LUDLOW GRISCOM, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass.

For Sale: Pamphlets relating to the Flora of New England.

<b>Batchelder, F. W.</b>	Preliminary List of Plants .... of Manchester, New Hampshire. 1909. 59 pp.....	\$ .50
<b>Brainerd, E.</b>	Some Natural Violet Hybrids of North America. 1924. 205 pp., ill.....	1.00
<b>Brainerd, E.</b>	Violets of North America. 1921. 172 pp., 25 colored pls., fig.....	1.50
<b>Hervey, E. W.</b>	Flora of New Bedford. Revised Ed. 1911. 137 pp.....	0.50
<b>Jesup, H. G.</b>	Flora and Fauna of Hanover, N. H. 1882. 74 pp.....	0.75

The above are perfect as to contents, but in some cases the covers are discolored or dirty:

Address Librarian, New England Botanical Club,  
Gray Herbarium, Cambridge, Mass.